

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/475,104	12/30/1999	NAGESH VODRAHALLI	042390.P6785	5963
7	7590 03/02/2004	EXAMINER		
WILLIAM W	SCHAAL	MITCHELL, JAMES M		
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP				
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
7TH FLOOR			2827	
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025			DATE MAILED: 03/02/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/475,104	VODRAHALLI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	James M. Mitchell	2827				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, erectified in the maximum statutory, period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 I</u>	December 2003.					
<u> </u>	is action is non-final.					
·	<del>, _</del>					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-23 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-23 is/are rejected.  7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 December 1999 is/ Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ object e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ction is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/475,104 Page 2

Art Unit: 2827

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

- 2. Claims 5-13 and 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no support in the specification to support the encapsulant differing in composition from the thermal epoxy.
- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 5-13 and 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 5-13 and 15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationship is: the placement of the encapsulant with respect to the other structures.

Application/Control Number: 09/475,104 Page 3

Art Unit: 2827

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 5-13, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang et al. (US6, 208,519) in combination with Beane (US. 6,003,586) and Fillion et al. (US 6,306,680).
- 7. Jiang (Fig 4, 5) discloses a method for assembling an integrated circuit package, comprising: applying a compliant, thermal adhesive (152) to a top surface of an integrated circuit (112), placing a thermal element (142) that distributes heat over an are and therefore is a spreader adjacent to the thermal adhesive; and curing the thermal adhesive and applying an encapsulant (150; non thermal) differing in composition from the thermal adhesive after curing of the thermal adhesive; and mounting the integrated circuit to a substrate (step 200); and attaching a solder ball (123) to the substrate; wherein the applying of the encapsulant comprises molding (Abstract) the encapsulant onto the substrate and the integrated circuit.
- 8. Jiang does not appear to disclose that the adhesive is an epoxy containing a thermally conductive filler of carbon or curing the epoxy with energy at a microwave frequency.

Application/Control Number: 09/475,104

Art Unit: 2827

9. However, Beane (Col. 5, Lines 16-21) utilize a compliant, epoxy that inherently contains a thermally conductive filler of carbon particles (via thermal epoxy; per applicant's admission, CLM 14 & 15 filed 09/27/ 2001).

Page 4

- 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the compliant material of Jiang as a thermal epoxy in order to provide a compliant layer as required by Jiang (step 210).
- 11. As to curing by microwave frequency, Fillion (Col. 4, Lines 62-66) utilizes a microwave frequency to cure epoxy via an inherent microwave generator selecting a frequency to cure epoxy without damaging IC (via patent presumed valid; i.e. operational), wherein the microwave generator is inherently directed toward the epoxy (via epoxy is cured).
- 12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize energy at a microwave frequency with the modified epoxy structure of Jiang and Beane, in order to cure an encapsulant as taught by Fillion (Col. 4, Lines 62-66) and that is required by Jiang (step 230).
- 13. Claims 19, 21, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jiang, Beane and Fillion in combination with AGEN (JP62-36091).
- 14. Jiang, Beane and Fillion disclose the elements of paragraphs 7-12 of this office action, but do not appear to disclose baking the substrate into/onto which the IC is to be mounted.

Application/Control Number: 09/475,104

Art Unit: 2827

15. AGEN teaches baking the substrate into/onto, which the IC is to be mounted

(Title).

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate baking

the substrate of Jiang into/onto which the IC is to be mounted, in order form

metallization of the substrate as taught by AGEN (Title) and required by Jiang (130).

Response to Arguments

Page 5

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot

in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The following comments are in response to

applicant's arguments that may still be applicable.

18. Applicant contends that Fillion does not show the epoxy situated on a top

surface. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Without express claim language defining the

geographic location of the top surface of an item, any surface is the top surface subject

to the viewer's interpretation (chips are mounted in various angles and positions).

Furthermore, Fillion was not relied for that teaching, but only to show the ability to cure

epoxy by a microwave frequency.

19. Applicant contends that the prior art does not suggest that baking occurs "prior to

curing of the thermal epoxy;" the point is most because there is no claimed sequential

limitation for the baking step.

Conclusion

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2827

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James M. Mitchell whose telephone number is (571) 272-1931. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamand Cuneo can be reached on (571) 272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/475,104

Art Unit: 2827

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DAVID E. GRAMINER PRIMAXE YRAMINER Page 7